

Appln No. 10/088,450

Amdt date June 7, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 6, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The amendment is submitted in response to the Office action of April 6, 2004, wherein the Examiner has rejected claims 6, 10, 14, 19, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, and a telephone conference held with the Examiner on June 4, 2004. Claims 1-22 remain in the application, and claims 6, 10, 14, 19, 20 and 21 have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

Specifically, claim 6 has been amended to specify that the grooves, slots or hooks are on the carrier plate and to delete the unnecessary limitation of side projections. Claim 10 has been amended to clarify the original sheet metal angle limitation. Claim 14 has been amended to clarify the location of the "edges." Claims 19, 20 and 21 were amended to clarify the antecedent basis.

Applicant respectfully requests that these amendments be entered in the instant case and that the rejected claims be allowed, as the Examiner's rejections have all been sufficiently addressed. Applicant notes again with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-18 and 22 are allowed and that claims 6, 10, 14 and 19-21 would be allowed if amended to overcome the Examiner's rejections expressed in the April 6th Office action. If the Examiner does not now deem all claims to be in proper form for allowance, Applicant

Appln No. 10/088,450


Amdt date June 7, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 6, 2004

respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at his earliest convenience to discuss possible solutions.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Rose A. Hickman
Reg. No. 54,167
626/795-9900

RAH/eaj